



EFW

Attorney Docket: 011765-0307460
Client Reference: AF/JG/P9429US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:
MILES

Confirmation Number: 7708

Application No.: 10/759,184

Group Art Unit: 2185

Filed: January 20, 2004

Examiner: Jae Un YU

Title: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR WRITING SERVO FRAMES TO AND/OR
VERIFYING DATA AREAS OF A STORAGE MEDIUM

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated June 26, 2006, the period for reply which is September 26, 2006 (note the PTO-326), Applicant hereby provisionally elects the invention of Group II, claims 15-51. This election is made with traverse.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's determination that Group I (claims 1-14) and Group II (claims 15-51) are related as subcombinations usable together is incorrect. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has mischaracterized the claimed inventions by alleging that Group I is drawn to simultaneous writing/verifying process and "has separate utility such as verifying (reading) previously written logic filed during writing process, but in subcombination 2, writing and reading process do not occur simultaneously."

As disclosed in the specification, the present invention interleaves the writing of fields of a servo frame with reading of fields of a servo frame so that the fields can be verified on-the-fly during the servo writing process. This interleaving and verification on-the-fly during the servo writing process saves significant time because it is not necessary to first write the servo frames and then move the disk to a separate verification station, as is done in the prior art. See, for example, paragraphs [0008], [0011], [0031], [0047], and [0063].

It is respectfully submitted that it is clear that Group I is not directed to simultaneous writing/verifying and Group II is not directed to writing and reading processes that do not

occur simultaneously, as alleged by the Examiner. As discussed above, in both groups the reading and writing are interleaved, i.e. do not occur simultaneously.

It is further respectfully submitted that the search and examination of all of the claims can be performed without a serious burden. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, interleaving the writing of the at least a portion of a position field of a servo frame to a track of a storage medium with reading of at least a portion of a previously written logic field of a servo frame of a track of the storage medium whereby said portion of the previously written logic field can be verified during the servo writing process. Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, (C) writing a first portion of the position field of said servo frame to a first part of said track with the write element; (D) moving the write element relative to the storage medium such that a second portion of said position field of said servo frame of said track can be written at a position that is at least spaced laterally of the track from said first portion; and (E) during the movement in step (D), reading at least a portion of at least one of (i) said logic field of said servo frame of said track and (ii) a logic field of a servo frame of another track, in order to allow said portion of the logic field to be verified.


As discussed above, the present invention interleaves the writing of fields of a servo frame with reading of fields of servo frame. This is done in order to allow said portion of the logic field to be verified, as recited in both claims 1 and 15. Claim 1 specifically recites interleaving the writing with reading. Although claim 15 does not specifically recite “interleaving,” it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that steps (C) – (E) of claim 15 (i.e. writing, moving the write element, and reading during movement of the write element) is interleaving of the reading and writing. Accordingly, the search and examination required for both claims 1 and 15 should be the same, not different as alleged by the Examiner.

MILES – 10/759,184
Attorney Docket: 011765-0307460

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John P. Darling", is written over the printed name.

JOHN P. DARLING
Reg. No. 44482
Tel. No. (703) 770-7745

Date: August 17, 2006

P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
Tel. No. (703) 770-7900
Fax No. (703) 770-7901